DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 519 FL 008 090

AUTHOR Starr, S. Frederick; Boisture, J. Bruce
TITLE Russian and Soviet Studies in the United States: A Review.
PUB DATE 72
NOTE 70p.
AVAILABLE FROM American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, Ohio State University, 190 W. 19th Avenue, Columbus, Ohio 43210 ($3.50)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Area Studies; College Curriculum; Cultural Awareness; Cultural Education; Curriculum Planning; Ethnology; Higher Education; *History; Language Enrollment; Language Instruction; Language Programs; Language Research; Language Teachers; Modern Language Curriculum; Modern Languages; Politics; Professional Training; Research Needs; *Russian; *Russian Literature; Second Language Learning; Slavic Languages; *State of the Art Reviews; Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS *Soviet Studies

ABSTRACT

This study was prepared to provide a convenient compendium of data for those participating in a conference on "Russian and Soviet Studies in the United States" held at the Institute of Advanced Studies in Princeton, New Jersey, in May, 1972. The purpose of the conference and of the study was to assess the state of teaching and research on the U.S.S.R. in the United States and to suggest means of improving them. The study is based on extensive interviews with leaders of the field of Soviet studies, on a review of the files of leading funding agencies, and on quantitative data on the field compiled by scholarly organizations in the field. Sharp declines in both Russian language and area studies have been registered during the last four years, and these declines are greater than the general decline in language enrollments. The broad picture revealed by the study includes two basic features: (1) the increasing concentration of major libraries and documentary resources in a few leading centers after a period of expansion at dozens of libraries and archival collections around the United States; and (2) the increasing decentralization of scholarly expertise on the U.S.S.R., to the extent that competent researchers are located at dozens of institutions in the United States. In addition to calling for a general renewal of support for training and reaserch in the area, the study stressed the need for a greater degree of coordination of scholarly efforts. (Author/CFM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: FL SO
In our judgement, this document is also of interest to the clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view.

ED130519

Russian and Soviet Studies in the United States

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FL008090

RUSSIAN AND SOVIET STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES:

A REVIEW

May, 1972

S. Frederick Starr

with

J. Bruce Boisture

This report was prepared at the request of Professor George F. Kennan of the Institute for Advanced Studies in Princeton. Its first purpose is to provide a convenient compendium of data, most of it heretofore available but widely dispersed, for the benefit of those participating in a "Conference on Russian and Soviet Studies" held at the Institute for Advanced Studies on May 12-13, 1972. Its second purpose is to present these same data to other specialists in the field, as well as to interested members of the public. The authors wish to express their gratitude to those numerous scholars and officials who have so kindly shared with them their knowledge and experience. They are also indebted to the Rockefeller Foundation for its support of the research on which the report is based. Finally, two notes on the conclusions sprinkled throughout the study: first, their purpose is not so much to prescribe a course of action as to stimulate discussion on issues where action will be necessary; second, it goes without saying that for these conclusions the authors alone bear responsibility.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction: An Overview of Funding 1

II. Training 6
- A. Language Training 7
  - 1. Russian 7
  - 2. Other Soviet Languages 11
- B. Area Training 12
  - 1. Institutions 12
  - 2. Evaluation 15
- C. Immediate Goals and Future Planning 19
  - 1. Immediate Goals: Area Training 20
  - 2. Immediate Goals: Language Training 21
  - 3. Long Range Goals and Future Planning 22

III. Research
- A. Support Facilities 32
  - 1. Bibliography 33
  - 2. Data Banks 35
  - 3. Archives 36
  - 4. Publishing 37
  - 5. Scholarly Exchanges 38
  - 6. Libraries 41
  - 7. Research Centers 44
- B. Research Projects 48
- C. Research Priorities 53

IV. Conclusions 57

Appendix I 63

Appendix II 66

I. INTRODUCTION
AN OVERVIEW ON FUNDING

Russian and Soviet studies might easily be overlooked amidst the vast budget of America's so-called "knowledge industry". They are but one component of the larger field of foreign area studies, and those area studies as a group claim at best a modest share of the resources devoted to education and research in the humanities and social sciences. An approximation of the total bill for the fiscal year 197[illegible] would be on the order of 59.8 million dollars (See Appendix I), the cost of about 36 miles of interstate highway.[1]

This figure covers matters of no small significance. We depend on this sum to maintain facilities with which to acquaint Americans with the Russian language, to prepare the nation's teachers of Russian and Soviet studies, to groom specialists on the Russian area for posts in government and industry and to carry out fundamental research on Soviet society, culture, and government. Given the prominence of the Soviet Union in world affairs today, the importance of these functions can scarcely be exaggerated: together they provide American society with the knowledge and expertise to deal effectively with all aspects of one of the most powerful and complex nations on earth.

For a decade and a half the size of the national in-

vestment in Russian and Soviet studies has been a topic of public concern. Area studies developed after World War II with the help of investment by the federal government and foundations. After 1966, foundation investment was curtailed and federal support in 1968 was put on an annual and emergency basis. It had always been assumed that the institutions would eventually have to cover these costs, but when the time came to do so the universities themselves were in straightened circumstances, which are unrelieved to this day. Meanwhile, the debate has continued at many levels.[2]

Three problems combine to render it extremely difficult to assume a well-informed position in such discussions. First, is the fact that funds are derived not from two sources alone but from four. Although National Defense Education Act (NDEA) funds have received the bulk of public attention since Sputnik, that source, on the average, has never provided more than about 13% of the budgets of the major centers of Russian studies and none for secondary centers;[3] the rest derives from foundations and especially from state revenues and internal institutional resources, which constitute the backbone of support for the field as a whole. Second, is the difficulty arising from the dispersal of these monies among literally hundreds of institutions of the most diverse sorts. And third, in the field of knowledge production, as Fritz Machlup put it, "no possible measure of output can be conceived that would be logically separate from a measure of input."[4] Stated simply,

it is all but impossible to measure what you get for your money.

The principal concern of the following review is not to demonstrate the need either to raise or lower total expenditure on the field as a whole. On the contrary, decisions taken at that level of generality are bound to result in misdirected energy and waste. Instead, let us divide the total field into its constituent parts and consider the present performance and needs of each separately.

There are numerous aspects of Soviet studies and one can conceive of many categories under which to arrange them. The distinction which we would like to stress is between those functions which serve primarily the needs of training, and those which relate first to research. Under training would be included anything involving the communication of present knowledge and skills to students or to the public at large, while research would cover all efforts directed towards expanding that knowledge or the analytic means through which it is acquired. These headings provide the major divisions of this report.

In making such a distinction we do not intend to weaken, let alone deny, the ideal of the teacher-scholar. Rather, such categories simply take cognisance of the fact that most specialists derive funds for teaching from one set of institutions, and for intensive research from another, or at least from another budget. Both functions can and probably should

be combined in the same person, but for purposes of analysis it is desirable to distinguish clearly between them.

Such a distinction might be drawn at all levels, and particularly in those institutions which set priorities in the field. During the past year, for example, discussions have been held in which training and research have been treated as competing interests, when in reality, of course, they are quite distinct, but complementary. Were this distinction to be more thoroughly institutionalized, it could well lead to a more harmonious and balanced development of the field.

FOOTNOTES: INTRODUCTION

1. Based on total mileage and projected total cost of the National Defense Interstate Highway System, as reported in U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 68:9 (March 2, 1970), p.34.

2. For a review of this general issue see Irwin T. Sanders, A Crisis of Dollars: The Funding Threat to Interrational Affairs in U.S. Higher Education, Education and World Affairs, New York, 1968, p. 31 f.

3. Information supplied by the Office of Education, Institute of International Studies. Total NDEA Title VI support for Soviet and East European Language and Area Centers, 1959-1972; Center budgets, fiscal year 1969.

4. Fritz Machlup, The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States, Princeton, 1962, p. 44.

II. TRAINING

Training, taken in the broadest sense, is the largest single element in foreign area studies in general and Russian studies in particular. The total sum devoted to language preparation and general teaching at all levels, from grade schools to graduate programs, is approximately eighty-five percent of the total Russian and Soviet studies budget. From the training programs come most specialists who later engage in fundamental research. The same programs prepare those who will make known the discoveries of fundamental research to the educated public at large.

By its nature, training in Russian and Soviet studies is especially difficult to assess. Compared to research, it takes place in far more diverse institutional settings, from inner city schools to the Foreign Service Institute. In addition, the range of tasks under the heading of training in Russian studies is extremely broad, with introductory language classes at one extreme and the preparation of teachers of graduate level Soviet economics at the other. Let us, therefore, review separately the two major components of training -- language preparation and area studies -- and conclude with a consideration of future training needs.

A. LANGUAGE TRAINING

1. Russian

Few assumptions about the Russian studies field as a whole seem more firmly rooted in public thinking than the belief that since the National Defense Education Act of 1958 the study of Russian has become general throughout the country. Nor is this view confined to non-specialists. Funding bodies no longer consider Russian to be on the "critical list" of underdeveloped foreign languages, and have shifted the focus of their attention to other more exotic tongues of Africa and Asia.

The following data for the years 1960 to 1970 indicate that the gains have been far less impressive than may be supposed:[1]

REGISTRATION IN RUSSIAN AT ALL
U.S. INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

	1960	1965	1968	1970
Enrollments	30,570	33,710	40,696	36,189
Index (1960= 100)	100	110.3	133.1	118.4
Index: all enrollment in higher education (1960=100)	100	154.2	209.7	236.8

Spot checks at major institutions indicate that the decline shown here continues in 1971-2.

In the high schools the decline of study of the Russian language has been even more dramatic than in higher education.[2]

	1965	1968	1970
All enrollments (Grades 7 -12)	32,027	28,605	22,872

Fourteen states in 1970 reported no students studying Russian at the secondary level, while another nine reported fifty or less; of these states, eleven were in the Plains and the South. In higher education twelve states, all in the Plains and the South, teach fewer than one hundred students. The only three states with more than two thousand students studying Russian in secondary school in 1970 were New York, Pennsylvania, and Illinois. Of these, New York and Pennsylvania, along with California, are the leaders in college level teaching of the language as well. Clearly, then, the opportunity to study the Russian language is very unequally distributed across the country at all levels of education.

One of the very few institutions that is teaching more Russian today than five years ago is the United States government. True, the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) in Arlington has not expanded its activities and is still turning out only ten trainees per annum to satisfy the needs of all civilian branches of the federal government. But the Defense Language Institute at Monterey is producing over

five hundred graduates a year after a lull in the late 1960's, and projects nearly a thousand by 1973.[3] Given the fact that the immersion program at this institution provides in a year what an academic program can provide in only five or more years, these figures are the more significant.

A feature of Russian language training is the low rate of carry-over from high-school programs into college language programs, and from college to graduate school. Though precise data on this phenomenon do not exist, it has been observed by Joe Malik, Jr., Secretary-Treasurer of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages (AATSEEL) and by Richard D. Lambert, author of a Report on Language and Area Programs commissioned by the Office of Education.[4] For numerous reasons, pupils who start Russian in high school are little inclined to continue it in college. Hence, the number of students who ever reach advanced courses is especially small. This is reflected in the small number of Americans of non-Russian background who have achieved interpreter level competence through channels other than the Army school at Monterey.

In brief, Russian language training is in a pronounced decline which shows no signs of abating. The full impact of this trend will be felt during the next three to five years as the number of army-trained language specialists increases vis-à-vis those trained in schools and univeristies. Without

Note extent to which language training, & particularly govt training is tending to become increasingly governmentalized.

attempting to elucidate the many factors contributing to this trend it would be well to point out one of its important aspects, namely, the extent to which this is a development peculiar to the Russian language. Experience at many campuses has shown that the abolition of language requirements affects Russian less than other major languages. Nonetheless, among the five leading modern languages studied in the United States, Russian has shown the least total growth since 1960 and the sharpest decline since 1968:[5]

INDEX OF GROWTH (1960=100)

	1965	1968	1970
French	162.4	169.6	157.0
German	146.4	148.0	138.6
Italian	205.7	272.5	307.3
Russian	110.3	133.1	118.4
Spanish	173.7	204.2	217.7
Total	159.9	174.7	171.6

PERCENT OF GROWTH BETWEEN SURVEYS

	1960-63	1963-65	1965-68	1968-70
French	32.1	23.0	4.4	-7.4
German	25.0	17.1	1.1	-6.3
Italian	51.4	35.8	32.5	12.8
Russian	9.7	0.5	20.7	-11.1
Spanish	38.0	25.8	17.6	6.7
Total	31.3	21.8	9.2	-1.8

It is interesting, at the same time, to see that the nine less commonly taught foreign languages (Arabic, Chinese, Hebrew, Polish, etc.) all registered from 40 to 500% growth

in the decade 1960-1970, though, of course, beginning at lower bases.[6] Today, Russian is a smaller component of foreign language instruction than it was at the time of Sputnik.[7]

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF
THE FIVE LEADING MODERN LANGUAGES

1960-70

	1960	1965	1968	1970
French	38.4	39.0	37.3	35.2
German	24.6	22.5	20.8	19.8
Italian	1.9	2.4	2.9	3.4
Russian	5.1	3.5	3.9	3.5
Spanish	30.0	32.6	35.1	38.1

To conclude, Russian is as yet unable to compete successfully with the major languages offered in American schools, nor is it maintaining the growth levels of the "exotic" tongues. Having signed out of the critical ward, it can not yet live a normal life on the outside.

2. Other Soviet Languages

Of the two-hundred secondary languages and dialects of the U.S.S.R., nine are taught in the United States: Armenian, Chuvash, Estonian, Georgian, Kirghiz, Latvian, Lithuanian, Ukrainian and Uzbek.[8] Total registration in these languages at undergraduate and graduate levels in the autumn of 1970 was 124 students. Of the languages of the U.S.S.R. proper only Armenian and Ukrainian had more than six students in

training in 1970. In addition, Turkish and Rumanian are taught to 170 and 13 students respectively, giving some access to related languages and dialects in the U.S.S.R.[9]

To be sure, these figures do not comprise the entire corps of Americans trained in the exotic languages of the U.S.S.R. Radio Liberty has on its staff specialists in a total of seventeen minority languages and many of these people are American citizens. Furthermore, there are many sons and daughters of immigrant parents who have learned minority tongues at home. Perhaps for this reason the NDEA and NDFL programs have devoted scant attention to the non-Russian languages of the Soviet republics. In 1970 NDEA centers were training only 27 of the 127 students of these languages, the restbeing supported at non-center institutions.

B. AREA TRAINING

1. Institutions

Area studies programs exist at undergraduate and graduate schools and to a very limited extent in high schools and government institutions. They have as their purposes a) general education, b) the preparation of men and women for careers requiring a broad acquaintance with the life and culture of Russia and the U.S.S.R., c) the training of future teachers of Russian area studies, and d) early prep-

aration of future research specialists. Programs leading to the BA and MA serve the first of these functions, while MA and PhD programs serve the latter three.

Degree granting programs in Russian area studies exist on eighty-three American campuses.[10] Sixty-three of these operate almost entirely on state and private funds, while twenty receive subsidization ranging from $26,000 to $186,000 each (or from 6% to 36% of their budgets) from the NDEA program.[11] NDFL grants are available in principle to all institutions teaching languages, but are in fact received at only twenty-two.

Exhaustive statistics on the numbers of degrees awarded at each level exist only for the twenty NDEA centers. Though these institutions granted 70% of the PhDs in the area for 1969,[12] their proportion of total training in Russian studies would probably decline at the MA level and still more markedly for BAs. Output at the twenty NDEA centers at all levels for the decade after 1960 was 5,666 BAs, 2,514 MAs and 737 PhDs, which constitutes the single largest group of area specialists prepared by all NDEA programs. The number of degree recipients at these institutions rose steadily to 1970, a trend which was paralleled on most of the other 63 campuses with Russian area programs. Even though NDEA institutional grants fell for two years before fiscal 1972, the combined <u>total</u> budgets for all Title VI centers have

registered a slight growth, suggesting a firm commitment to area studies by at least some of the host universities.

At the same time, strong evidence that Russian area study programs have reached a critical juncture cannot be ignored. To some extent the high enrollments since 1969 are illusory, since they reflect interests generated by language study before that time. The reduction in language study is bound to reduce the pool of students from which area specialists can be drawn in the future. This, along with other factors, has already contributed to a sharp drop in enrollments in Soviet area courses at ten of the twenty NDEA centers. In 1970-1971 total NDEA enrollments (excluding language) fell by four percent from the previous year, but at ten of the centers the decline was 54%.[13] Soviet and East European studies, incidentally, were the only area programs patronized by NDEA to show any decline at all.

Those institutions lacking a firm commitment to Soviet area studies and to the language training that makes them possible will experience similar difficulties as soon as the reduction in Russian language study is felt. Either they will maintain their programs at the superficial level which foreign language illiteracy necessitates, or they will pare them down as serious demand declines. Some institutions, such as the State University of New York, which reduced the staff of its International Studies Division from fifteen to two, seem

already to have taken a decision on this matter. Others can be expected to do so as circumstances dictate.

2. Evaluation

Turning now to the substantive aspects of Soviet area studies, it is well at the outset to take note of the success of major centers in integrating language study into their programs. Richard Lambert, in his comparative study of all foreign area programs in the nation, found that graduates in the Soviet and the East Europe area (mostly Russian) were relatively better equipped linguistically than those of other world regions. Furthermore, on the whole the graduates are relatively well travelled in the nations whose life and culture they study.[14] The large quantities of students to receive first hand exposure to the U.S.S.R. must be attributed in part to the expanded possibilities for tourism there. But the quality of their introduction to Soviet life is a measure of the work of the International Research and Exchange Board and of the eighteen summer study tours originating on American campuses and staffed by qualified specialists.[15] Together, such programs perform the valuable task of presenting the Soviet Union to students in the most concrete terms possible.

Three qualifications might be entered on the general success of the area programs. First, the very unequal dis-

tribution of teaching personnel among the various disciplines renders it all but inevitable that certain aspects of Russian and Soviet studies should be stressed at the expense of others. To a far greater extent than any other world area, Russian studies are dominated by history and by language and literature. This fact, noted by Ivo J. Lederer (among others) in his Report of the Committee on the Future (1968),[16] is dramatically presented by the figures on the disciplinary composition of the membership of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies (AAASS),[17]

History	39.7%
Literature and Language	16.8
International Relations	14.0
Political Science	11.3
Economics	4.4
Geography	2.0
Law	1.6
Sociology	1.6
Education	1.5
Philosophy	1.5
Anthropology	.7
Arts	.5
Journalism	.5
Religion	.5
Demography	.4
Psychology	.3
Archaeology	.2
Natural Sciences	.2
Library	2.3
	100.0%

Since all but 13% of these specialists hold academic posts, we may take this as a fair profile of the manpower pool for Russian and East European area studies. The trends which it discloses would only be reinforced with the addition of

those fifteen hundred members of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and Eastern European Languages (AATSEEL) who are not also members of AAASS.

The overwhelming majority of specialists in the Russian area are thus clustered around the concerns of history, politics, literature, and linguistics. It is natural and indeed beneficial that this should be the case, or, at least, that it should have been the case until now. For a knowledge of the language, literature and history of a people provides an invaluable foundation upon which to base further studies. But alone they are not capable of providing the fully rounded understanding of the U.S.S.R. which area studies trainees have a right to expect, nor can concentration on these areas at the exclusion of others be salutary even for these disciplines themselves.

This one-sidedness has been a subject for concern in the field for nearly a decade but improvement has been slow in coming. Figures on the disciplinary foci of current graduate students indicate that no major changes at the faculty level can be expected for at least three to four years, and it will require several years after that for the first students of these young specialists to emerge. Though the International Research and Exchange Board (IREX) is working vigorously to stimulate interest in sociology, social psychology, anthropology, etc., the fruits of that campaign may

not appear until even farther in the future.

A second qualification to the generally impressive record of Soviet area training programs is that for the most part they are not truly Soviet but narrowly Great Russian in scope. Linguistic aspects of this problem have been noted above. Let us here simply take note of the fact that existing knowledge on the national and ethnic sub-groups of the U.S.S.R. has yet to be adequately incorporated into the textbooks and course syllabi in use in most training programs. The formation of the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies three years ago, and more recently, of the Association for the Study of the Nationalities (U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe), as well as the nationalities programs at the University of Washington, UCLA, and in Columbia's Program in Soviet Nationalities Studies, all may lead to improvements in this situation, but this will depend on the extent to which these and other such bodies perceive their task in terms of influencing training in Soviet area studies. Until they do, trainees will be denied contact with an important and to some extent unique aspect of Russia's historical development, and of the Soviet Union's present social structure.

A third qualification to the success of area training has been the failure to adjust programs to actual career needs. Over 7,000 people have completed doctorates in the Russian-Soviet area, each of them devoting from one to six

years to highly specialized research dissertations. Of these people scarcely a quarter have published anything at all and by no means all of these consider themselves to be primarily research scholars.[18] The vast majority of PhD recipients have retrained themselves as Soviet area generalists in order to make their contribution as teachers.

The long dissertation is doubtless an excellent preparation for the scholar-teacher, but it is a costly burden for those whose deepest interests lie in communicating existing knowledge to students at our burgeoning colleges and universities. The direct and indirect costs of supporting just the two final years of dissertation research over the past decade and a half may reach ten million dollars.

A promising alternative to this pattern may lie in the Doctor of Arts degree newly instituted at Ohio State University. This degree, designed to prepare teachers for advanced levels, will require high attainments in area and discipline study but not the lengthy dissertation. The experiment may prove worthy of emulation if area studies expand significantly in junior colleges and other two-year institutions.

C. TRAINING: IMMEDIATE GOALS AND FUTURE PLANNING

To alter the development of the field so as to meet

these needs and others which may arise in the future will require certain adjustments in the present pattern of resource allocations. Some of these modifications are extremely modest and would require no gross additions to present funds for training. Other demands may appear later, however, which could only be met by more basic changes in the overall level of training support. It is therefore important to consider here both short term measures to satisfy immediate demands and also those means by which longer range needs may be identified and met.

1. Immediate Goals: Area Training

1. THE PRIMARY SHORT RANGE NEEDS IN AREA TRAINING ARE TO INTRODUCE A BROADER RANGE OF DISCIPLINARY FOCI INTO THE CURRICULA AND TO BROADEN RUSSIAN STUDIES TO INCLUDE OTHER NATIONALITIES OF THE U.S.S.R. AT PRESENT, THE IREX PROGRAM OFFERS THE MOST PROMISING CHANNEL TO MEET BOTH OF THESE. ENCOURAGEMENT MIGHT BE GIVEN TO IREX AND ITS MAJOR FUNDING SOURCES TO EXPAND EFFORTS TO TRAIN PERSONS IN NEGLECTED DISCIPLINES, AS WELL AS TO PROMOTE NATIONAL AREA STUDIES.

2. SINCE THE LEAD TIME BETWEEN IREX TRAINING AND CURRICULAR CHANGE MAY BE AS GREAT AS FIVE YEARS,

OTHER EFFORTS SHOULD BE MADE FOR THE IMMEDIATE FUTURE. ENCOURAGEMENT MIGHT BE GIVEN TO INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS IN THE SOVIET AREA TO TAKE A SEMESTER TO "RETOOL" EITHER IN A RELATED DISCIPLINE OR IN THE STUDY OF A NON-RUSSIAN REGION OF THE U.S.S.R. THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE OF THE AAASS MIGHT MAKE KNOWN SOURCES OF SUPPORT FOR SUCH RETRAINING, AND MIGHT EXPLORE THE POSSIBILITY OF SPECIAL FUNDS FOR THIS PURPOSE.

2. Immediate Goals: Language Training

1. LEAVING ASIDE FOR NOW THE NUMBERS OF LANGUAGE TRAINEES NEEDED, LET US NOTE THAT WITH THE DROPS IN ENROLLMENT THE PER CAPITA COSTS OF TRAINING ARE RISING. GIVEN THIS, AND GIVEN THE FACT THAT RUSSIAN IS THE MOST DEMANDING OF THE FIVE MAJOR LANGUAGES TAUGHT IN THE UNITED STATES, IT MIGHT BE TIMELY TO CONSIDER THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A COOPERATIVE "RUSSIAN LANGUAGE CENTER" TO PROVIDE ONE SEMESTER OR YEAR-LONG IMMERSION COURSES FOR STUDENTS FROM A NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS.[19] PATTERNED ALONG THE LINES OF THE MONTEREY SCHOOL, SUCH A CENTER WOULD ASSURE THAT

THERE WOULD BE A BODY OF CIVILIAN-TRAINED LANGUAGE EXPERTS, WHATEVER NATIONAL ENROLLMENT TRENDS MAY BE. STUDENTS WOULD MOVE THERE FOR A FIXED PERIOD WITH THE REASONABLE ASSURANCE (NOW LACKING IN MANY LANGUAGE PROGRAMS) OF EMERGING AT THE END WITH A SOLID GROUNDING IN THE LANGUAGE.

3. Long Range Goals and Future Planning

It is impossible to make well informed decisions at any level on the future development of the field of Russian and Soviet studies without complete and reliable information of two sorts. First, data on present manpower resources must be available, and second, projections on future manpower needs must be made, if only in general terms.

Such information is so critical that without it one is at a loss to evaluate Russian and Soviet area training to date. Note has been made of the recent sharp decline in Russian language study, and the parallel reductions in area training. Are these to be regretted? Should measures be taken to reverse these trends?

Considerable evidence of an impressionistic nature can be harbored to argue that present demand has in fact been satisfied, and that it would be vain to encourage expansion of training in any quarter. Three fourths of the alumni of

the BA language program at Indiana University are employed in posts which do not tap their Russian skills while half of the 375 alumni of Boston College's MA program in Russian studies are now working in banking and industry. Some of the latter group are surely calling on skills and knowledge gained during graduate study. Even if they were not, one would have no grounds for doubting the personal benefits which their studies brought them, any more than one would in the case of the Indiana BAs. But in neither case was societal demand great enough to attract them to careers that would utilize their area skill, and if such demand existed at all it was too weak to compete successfully with alternatives. As evidence that the current demand has been satisfied, one might also cite those United States PhDs teaching in Canada and Australia and the difficulty experienced by many other recent PhDs in finding employment at the level for which they were trained.

In the absence of information to the contrary, we are inclined to give credence to this evidence. But such impressions do not constitute data upon which policy could or should be based. Where, then, is such data to be found?

Seven organs presently collect information on the current state of Russian and Soviet area training. The 2,400 member AAASS regularly publishes lists of doctoral dissertations in the field. It does not, however, prepare

similar registries by discipline of MA and BA trainees, nor does it have the facilities to follow up on careers even of PhDs. A sample of its membership indicates that only 3% teach in high schools, so the AAASS as presently constituted would have difficulty reaching the full field. The Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages is also interested in collecting certain information from its membership, but this group, too, includes few high school teachers.

Another source of data is the Institute of International Studies of the Office of Education. Its information is comprehensive for the centers which it supports, but since such centers are only a small (and diminishing) part of the field, data on them alone will necessarily be quite inadequate. More complete are the holdings of the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC), though these data tend not to be sufficiently disaggregated for more detailed uses. The American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) maintains files on foreign area studies which could be consulted in the future, and the American Council of Education (ACE) is also forming an Office of International Education which will compile data on existing programs at its member campuses.

Comprehensive information on language training is regularly released by the Foreign Language Survey Bureau

of the Modern Language Association (MLA). In their scope and accuracy these are probably among the most satifactory data on any aspect of the Russian and Soviet fields, and should be more fully utilized by the profession.

1. IT IS STRIKING THAT NO GROUP CONCERNED SPECIFICALLY WITH SOVIET STUDIES REGULARLY ASSEMBLES AND PUBLISHES COMPLETE STATISTICAL INFORMATION ON THE PRESENT STATE OF TRAINING IN THE FIELD. GIVEN THE IMPORTANCE OF SUCH INFORMATION FOR PLANNING DECISIONS AT ALL LEVELS, WE BELIEVE IT SHOULD BE BROUGHT TOGETHER AT REGULAR INTERVALS (PREFERABLY EVERY THREE TO FIVE YEARS), AND THAT THE PROPER ORGANIZATION FOR CARRYING OUT THIS ASSIGNMENT IS THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SLAVIC STUDIES.

The absence of serious projections on future manpower needs has been a conspicuous feature of the pioneering phases of all area studies in the United States. Now, when a change of only five percent in the number of degrees awarded per annum can affect the manpower pool by well over a hundred persons, it is no longer possible to do without estimates on needs. It is unjust to the trainees themselves and unwise from the standpoint of resource use to provide training without the likelihood of jobs.

Available projections of future manpower demands are wholly inadequate. The academic world is the single largest consumer of manpower in area studies, but no disaggregated estimates for its future needs exist. The only projections of any sort available are those for 1980 drawn up by the National Center for Educational Statistics, which indicate the following:

EARNED DEGREES

1970-71, 1980-81[20]

	1970-71	1980-81
BA: social science and humanities	674,140	1,075,800
social sciences	166,010	306,070
foreign languages	21,840	34,530
MA: social sciences and humanities	179,940	325,040
social sciences	20,500	38,200
foreign languages	5,420	9,730
PhD: social sciences and humanities	17,350	42,640
social sciences	3,960	8,510
foreign languages	1,010	1,800

Besides their excessive generality, these figures tell little about actual staff needs.

Figures on primary and secondary education are even

less helpful. Nor would data from state education associations alone suffice for projections, since federal policy may well produce dramatic changes at this level in the near future. Indeed legislation has already been drafted which would extend foreign studies into the curricula of primary and secondary schools across the country.[21] Should this be enacted, the demand for BAs, MAs and DAs -- but not PhDs -- would doubtless soar.

The second major consumers of manpower in the Soviet area are industry and banking, which to date have absorbed some 19% of all degree recipients at reporting NDEA Soviet and East European centers.[22] Once more, any projections would be extremely tentative, although one can anticipate that growth in this sector would increase demand mainly at the BA and MA levels.

The third main consumer of manpower trained in the Soviet area is the federal government, with 13% of all degree recipients from NDEA Soviet and East European Centers. A survey on future staff needs has been undertaken by Dr. Richard Thompson, Director of the Division of Foreign Studies in the Institute of International Studies. Such information has never before been systematically compiled.

1. IN LIGHT OF THIS SITUATION, IT WOULD BE WELL TO CONSIDER WHETHER PROJECTIONS ON FUTURE MANPOWER SHOULD NOT BE COMPILED AT REGULAR INTERVALS OF

FROM THREE TO FIVE YEARS BY A QUALIFIED BODY WITHIN THE PROFESSION, PROBABLY THE AAASS, IN COORDINATION WITH FEDERAL, STATE, ACADEMIC AND OTHER BODIES. SUCH ESTIMATES, ALONG WITH DATA ON PRESENT STAFFING LEVELS, WOULD THEN BE PUBLISHED AND MADE AVAILABLE TO FUNDING BODIES, THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR TRAINING PROGRAMS, SPECIALISTS IN THE AREA, AND FUTURE STUDENTS.

2. IF THE AAASS WERE TO ASSUME RESPONSIBILITY FOR COORDINATING AND DISSEMINATING INFORMATION IN THIS AREA, AS WELL AS FOR COLLECTING STATISTICS ON EXISTING PROGRAMS IN THE FIELD, IT WOULD HAVE TO DEVOTE RELATIVELY MORE ATTENTION THAN AT PRESENT TO THE NEEDS OF TRAINING. TO THIS END IT MIGHT 1) ESTABLISH DIRECT CONTACT WITH TEACHERS AT THE SECONDARY LEVEL, 2) DEVELOP FURTHER ITS ORGANIZATION AT THE STATE AND REGIONAL LEVEL, AND 3) PROMOTE THE DEVELOPMENT OF GROUPS PATTERNED AFTER OHIO'S FLEDGLING CONFERENCE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THE SOVIET AND EAST EUROPEAN AREA.

3. IF THE OFFICE OF EDUCATION SHOULD IN THE FUTURE UNDERTAKE MAJOR PROGRAMS TO INTRODUCE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE AND AREA STUDIES AT THE PRIMARY OR SECONDARY LEVEL, IT SHOULD AT THE SAME TIME MAKE PROVISIONS TO SPONSOR THE TRAINING OF ANY NEW

· SPECIALISTS THAT SUCH PROGRAMS WOULD REQUIRE.

1. Richard I. Brod, Modern Language Association of America, "Survey of Foreign Language Registrations and Student Contact Hours in U.S. Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1970 and Summer 1971." U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Institute of International Studies, March 1972, Table D,p.x.

2. Based on preliminary data from an unpublished "Foreign Language Survey" of high school enrollments in Russian supplied by Richard I. Brod, MLA.

3. Information supplied by Col. Kibbey M. Horne, Commandant,Defense Language Institute, West Coast Branch, Presidio of Monterey.

4. In both cases impressions on this subject were conveyed to the authors in personal conversation.

5. Richard I. Brod, "Foreign Language Survey" p. x, Table D.

6. Ibid., p. ix, Table E.

7. Ibid., p. ix, Table C.

8. Information on languages taught from "Courses to be Offered at NDEA Language and Area Centers, 1971-72." Institute of International Studies, August 1971, and supplemented with data from non-NDEA centers and MLA.

9. Ibid., pp. 31-32, Table 16.

10. International Council for Educational Development, Area Studies on U.S. Campuses: A Directory. New York, March, 1971. p. 61.

11. Information supplied by Office of Education, Institute of International Studies, for fiscal year 1969.

12. PhDs at NDEA centers from chart titled "Degrees Awarded at 107 NDEA Language and Area Centers, 1959-1970." Total PhDs in the field approximated for 1969 from Jesse Dossick, "Doctoral Dissertation on Russia, the Soviet Union, and Eastern Europe Accepted by American, Canadian and British Universities", Slavic Review. v. 29:4.

13. Derived from chart titled "Enrollment at 107 NDEA Language and Area Centers, Fall 1967-70." Institute of International Studies, U.S. Office of Education, April, 1971.

14. Richard D. Lambert, Language and Area Studies Programs Review. Preliminary draft, 1972. On linguistic preparation, see p. III-35, Table 3.30. On frequency of travel, see p. III-26, Table 3, 26.

15. Constance A. Bezer, ed., Soviet Union and Eastern Europe: Financial Aid, Exchanges, Language and Travel Programs (A Preliminary Survey). Columbus, Ohio,1971. p. 105.

16. Ivo J. Lederer, chmn. IUCTG Committee on the Future, Report On Scholarly Exchanges and Relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in 1970-1980. February 1969. p. 13.

17. Membership statistics supplied by George Demko, former Executive Secretary, AAASS, and Leon Twarog, Executive Secretary, AAASS. Figures on the disciplines of FAFP applicants from 1954 to 1972 are even more lopsided, with 940 of 2256 applicants from History, 619 from Political Science, 156 from International Relations and only 7 in Social Psychology. FAFP, "Social and East European Studies, Statistics on Applicants," p. 4.

18. See below, "Research," fn.1.

19. The Tolstoy Foundation has made a similar proposal to create such a program at its premises in Valley Cottage, New York. See its "Project for the Development of an Institute for the Intensive Study of the Russian Language."

20. "Higher Education, 1980: New Federal Projections." The Chronicle of Higher Education. 6:28 (April 17, 1972), p. 1.

21. This program has already been considered in Congress and discussed before professional groups. Institute of International Studies, Monthly Report, February, 1972, p. 1. A pending Ethnic Studies Bill would have a similar effect.

22. Information on career choices of NDEA Soviet and East European Centers graduates supplied by the Institute of International Studies, U. S. Office of Education.

III. RESEARCH

We have tried to indicate the benefits to be gained from considering the functions of training and research as related but quite distinct for purposes of evaluation and planning in the field. No precise estimate of the number of American specialists engaged in expanding our knowledge of Russia and the U.S.S.R. can be made, but it is only a small proportion even of the group to have received advanced training. If the list of scholars to publish articles or have books reviewed in major journals for a three year period is any indicator, the total for all disciplines may not be much more than four hundred.[1] Perhaps twenty-five to forty per cent of these are at present Title VI centers and the rest are scattered among university and research facilities across the country.[2] If advanced training continues at present levels, the number of people prepared for research will continue to rise until the 1990s, at which time new enrollees will only replace those retiring.

In this brief review of research on Russia and the Soviet Union, three general issues will be considered: 1) support facilities, 2) research projects, and 3) priority setting. Conclusions and suggestions appear after each section.

A. SUPPORT FACILITIES

Though research in the social sciences and humanities requires no laboratories, in most fields extensive support facilities are essential. These facilities include libraries and data banks, centers, exchanges, archives and bibliographies. The past decade has seen intensive efforts to develop each of these areas, with the result that in most cases they are now comparable to and in several cases superior to analogous facilities for other area studies fields.

1. Bibliography

The need for adequate bibliographic resources has long been recognized in the Soviet and Russian fields, and has been the subject of discussion at the Greyston Conference (1966), by the Coordinating Committee on Slavic and East European Library Resources and in the Bibliography and Documentation Committee of the AAASS.[3] Numerous resources have come and gone in this field, including the Library of Congress Monthly Accession List, the AISIS, and the publications of the soon to be defunct Slavic Bibliographic and Documentation Center in Washington. Others, such as the MLA Bibliography, continue to cover certain fields adequately, while still others, such as the American Bibliography for Russian and East European Studies, have been permitted to

lapse only to be revived later. Given the proliferation of printed matter, it is obvious that the problem of bibliography will continue to loom large in the future. Furthermore the fact that 81 doctoral dissertations were completed in the United Kingdom and Canada between 1960 and 1968, and that significant volumes of major research are appearing in the Federal Republic of Germany, in Italy and in France, gives to the problem an international dimension which it may have lacked heretofore.

The following three issues seem especially critical at present:

1) TO REGULARIZE FUNDING FOR THE CONTINUED PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN STUDIES, NOW FINANCED ON AN EMERGENCY AD HOC BASIS.
2) TO REVIEW THE BIBLIOGRAPHIC PROBLEM IN GENERAL IN ORDER TO PREVENT COSTLY FALSE STARTS IN THE FUTURE, AND PARTICULARLY TO ASSESS THE NEED FOR AN INTERNATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHY INCLUDING WESTERN EUROPE AND NORTH AMERICA.
3) TO EXPLORE THE NEED FOR REVIVING THE PUBLICATION OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH, USSR AND EASTERN EUROPE, PUBLISHED FORMERLY BY THE OFFICE OF EXTERNAL RESEARCH OF THE STATE DEPARTMENT AND INCLUDING ALL NON-CLASSIFIED RESEARCH

BY THE U.S. GOVERNMENT.[4]

2. Data Banks

Computerized data banks are increasingly a feature of advanced research in the social sciences. They facilitate transnational comparisons as well as complex studies on one region or issue involving diverse and voluminous data. For the Soviet field there exist several collections of computerized data, including those at the Inter-University Consortium for Political Science Research in Ann Arbor, the Berkeley Archival Retrieval Service (BEAR), the Population Research Center at Princeton and UNESCO, not to mention of course, those held by individual scholars or by the various classified governmental data banks.

James N. Rosenau, in his review of International Studies and the Social Sciences (1971), found general agreement among social scientists that neither the quantity nor the quality of computerized data is adequate for present needs in the fields.[5] This is especially true for the Soviet area, where broad discrepencies exist in both the types and volume of computerized information. This situation discourages research of this sort at a time when serious concern has been shown for the state of social science research on the U.S.S.R.

TO CORRECT THIS SITUATION WE WOULD SUGGEST THAT A

THOROUGH REVIEW OF EXISTING DATA BANK FACILITIES FOR THE U.S.S.R. BE UNDERTAKEN AND THAT, ON THE BASIS OF THE CONCLUSIONS OF THAT REVIEW, RECOMMENDATIONS ON MEANS OF DEVELOPING AND UTILIZING THESE FACILITIES BE FORWARDED TO SCHOLARS IN THE FIELD AND TO RELEVANT INSTITUTIONS. AN APPROPRIATE BODY TO INITIATE SUCH A REVIEW MIGHT BE THE BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DOCUMENTATION COMMITTEE OF THE AAASS.

3. Archives

Archival material constitutes an important component of the documentation for many of the historical, literary and social sciences. In recognition of this fact, Patricia Grimsted has completed a study of Archives and Manuscript Repositories in the USSR: Moscow and Leningrad,[6] and has undertaken a similar volume on regional archives of the USSR. These worthy compilations by no means complete the task of registering archival holdings pertaining to Russia and the U.S.S.R. Indeed, they only serve to make more obvious the need for adequate guides to archival holdings in the West.

It may well be that this issue cannot be resolved for Russian and Soviet materials without first dealing with the broader bibliographic problem of which it is a part. None-

theless, the effort by IREX to collect data on microfilm copies of Soviet archival documents held by former exchange participants represents a constructive first step. It is to be hoped that these data (if not the films themselves) will eventually be entrusted to the Library of Congress or the National Archive, and that they will be periodically supplemented in the future.

STILL MORE IMPORTANT WOULD BE TO BEGIN THE MASSIVE TASK OF PREPARING A CONCISE INDEX TO MAJOR RUSSIAN-SOVIET MATERIALS IN AMERICAN AND WEST EUROPEAN COLLECTIONS.

If an international commission could be formed which would include those specialists in France and England who have already begun work in this direction, it may well be possible to hasten the day when western archival materials would be fully exploited by scholars. Two likely sources of funding for such an undertaking would be the National Endowment of the Humanities and the Council of Library Resources.

4. Publishing

The extent and quality of facilities for publication is a fair indicator of the level of development of a field of study. By that measure, Russian and Soviet Studies have reached a position of strength. Besides the perennial ten-

sion between area and disciplinary interests, the leading journals adequately reflect the level of work in the field. University and trade presses look favorably on works dealing with Russia and the U.S.S.R., and the major research centers have maintained excellent house series thanks to favorable arrangements with publishers. Indeed, it is unlikely that a competent work of article or book length would not find a publisher today.

Only three possible problem areas exist: 1) translations; 2) Russian and Soviet language publications; 3) short monographs.

The cost of Russian translation remains high compared to that of other leading foreign languages taught in the United States. Although the differential is not vast — about $3 per 1,000 words — it is sufficient to raise the cost of a translated volume in Russian to 20% above that for a work of the same length in French, German, Spanish or Italian. Only long-term changes in Russian language teaching will affect this, although subsidies might have a beneficial short-term impact.

The difficulty of publishing books or sections of books in cyrillic script has caused no major concern to date due to the accessibility of cryillic presses in the Netherlands, Switzerland, and Yugoslavia. However, should interest in forming such a facility in this country increase,

the Publishing Committee of the AAASS might investigate the possibility of a joint undertaking by several university presses together.

Of far greater moment is the need for subsidization of short monographs of from forty to two hundred pages in length. At present it is virtually impossible to publish works of this length, and rising printing costs foreclose all prospects of the situation improving. Formerly, the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council gave modest publication grants to lower the cost of books, but these have been discontinued, as have the Columbia Center subsidies. Today, there is no major funding agency which regularly includes publication aid in its grant. It might therefore be timely

TO CALL UPON FOUNDATIONS AND OTHER FUNDING AGENCIES TO CONSIDER THE CREATION OF SPECIAL PUBLICATION GRANTS FOR WORKS IN THE FORTY TO TWO HUNDRED PAGE RANGE, AND THROUGH THE PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE AAASS TO EXPLORE MEANS OF ESTABLISHING AT A MAJOR CENTER A MONOGRAPH SERIES FOR WORKS OF THIS LENGTH.

5. Scholarly Exchanges

The opportunity of conducting research in the U.S.S.R. has contributed significantly to the development of the

Russian and Soviet studies in this country. Nearly a thousand Americans have taken advantage of this opportunity and have worked in an expanding range of Soviet research institutions for periods of several months to two years. In addition, the Fulbright-Hays program has sent from one to two specialists per annum to Finland or Western Europe to pursue work in Soviet area studies.[7] The organization of all American-Soviet exchanges was in 1968 concentrated in IREX, whose leaders have worked to perpetuate and broaden existing possibilities for scholarly exchange.

Few organizations engaged in promoting scholarly contact with other nations can claim such widespread support from their respective fields as IREX, and few have done as much to earn that support. It might be well, then,

TO RECOMMEND TO THE GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND FOUNDATIONS WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO THE MAINTENANCE OF IREX THAT THEY PLACE THEIR SUPPORT ON A MORE LONG TERM BASIS, SUBJECT TO PERIODIC REVIEW.

A second form of scholarly contact with the U.S.S.R. has only recently been inaugurated with the establishment by the American Historical Association and the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences of semi-annual joint historical seminars on topics of mutual interest. Though these week-long seminars are not intended for American specialists on the U.S.S.R., they do provide a format which might profitably be emulated

by Soviet area specialists through their respective disciplines.

A third area of scholarly exchange would entail joint research projects with Soviet scholars, and is considered below under "Research Projects."

6. Libraries.

No support facility is more essential for basic research than libraries. During the past decade enormous strides have been made in library development at all levels. Universities have assigned major funds to build research collections, while other academic institutions have formed smaller training libraries. The NDEA program has aided twenty institutions in expanding their holdings, and the Library of Congress's National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloguing (NPAC) has enabled libraries of all sizes to save substantial funds by using a centralized cataloguing service. During the three years of its existence the Slavic Bibliography and Documentation Center published New Slavic Publications and other materials to aid smaller libraries in using limited resources as effectively as possible. Exchanges have been arranged between various American libraries and the major institutions in the Soviet Union. And, finally, a group of competent specialists in Soviet bibliogrpahy has developed in the staffs of the major collections.

The challenge of the 1970s will be to continue this effort so far as possible, at the same time making intelligent alternative plans where changed conditions require them. The changed conditions include 1) a general increase in the cost of books printed in the U.S.S.R., 2) a pronounced increase in the rate of new publications in the humanities and social sciences in the U.S.S.R., 3) a substantial increase in the cost of processing new acquisitions at all U.S. libraries, 4) the unwillingness of the centralized foreign acquisitions office for Soviet libraries to expand further the exchange of books with American libraries, 5) the ending of certain indirect library subsidies from foundations and the focusing of NDEA library support at probably only five or six institutions, as compared to the present twenty.

Let us consider the last factor in detail. At present, NDEA Title VI centers spend from $3750 to $220,000 per annum for acquiring and processing new books in the Soviet and East European area. Although actual NDEA library contributions rarely exceed 15% of the total Title VI center budgets, at most institutions the substantial local investment in library resources is justified on the basis of the total NDEA commitment to the Russian area. Hence, the likely drop in library budgets when NDEA funds are withdrawn may be far more substantial than simply the amount of the

present NDEA library contribution.

The impact of all the factors cited above will soon lead to greater concentration of major library resources than at present.

It is essential to meet this situation in a constructive manner. At the very least, it will be necessary:

1. TO ENCOURAGE ALL BUT THE LARGEST LIBRARIES TO FOCUS THEIR ACQUISITIONS IN AREAS OF OUTSTANDING STRENGTH, AND TO COORDINATE FURTHER ACQUISITIONS AND USE IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUCH SPECIALIZATION.
2. TO URGE CONGRESS TO APPROPRIATE FUNDS TO ENABLE THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS 1) TO CONTINUE AND EXPAND ITS NATIONAL PROGRAM FOR ACQUISITIONS AND CATALOGUING,[8] AND 2) TO UNDERTAKE THE PUBLICATION OF THE CYRILLIC UNION CATALOG, AS WELL AS ADDITIONS TO THE C.U.C. NOT INCLUDED IN THE MANSELL EDITION OF THE PRE-1956 NATIONAL UNION CATALOG.[9]

At the same time, it may be deemed advisable:

TO DESIGNATE A LIMITED NUMBER OF RUSSIAN AND SOVIET COLLECTIONS AS NATIONAL RESOURCES, ACQUISITIONS AT WHICH SHOULD NOT BE ALLOWED TO DROP UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES. THE PLIGHT OF THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY IN THIS REGARD IS PARTICULARLY DEPLORABLE, NOTWITHSTANDING THE RECENT GRANT OF $500,000 TO THAT INSITUTION BY THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE

HUMANITIES. THE IMPORTANCE OF MAINTAINING THESE COLLECTIONS SHOULD BE EMPHASIZED IN PRESENTATIONS TO PUBLIC AND PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS BY AREA AND DISCIPLINE ORGANIZATIONS, AS WELL AS BY INDIVIDUAL SPECIALISTS.

A further area of concern involves acquisitions in the non-Slavic languages of the U.S.S.R., particularly those of Central Asia and the Caucasus.[10] In the Library of Congress and all other libraries surveyed for this report, acquisitions in these languages are handled by Orientalia divisions, where they are assigned a low order of priority. Given the large number of Soviet publications in the non-Russian languages, this is greatly to be regretted. These comprised 22% of all books and brochures printed in 1966 and fully 51% of books in the humanities published in 1967 (though only 15% of works in science and technology).[10] If study of the national areas is to increase it is important:

TO MAKE KNOWN TO THE MAJOR LIBRARIES THE NEED FOR SYSTEMATIC PROGRAMS OF ACQUISITIONS IN THE MINORITY LANGUAGES OF THE U.S.S.R.

7. Research Centers.

It is generally agreed that research progresses best in an environment that includes abundant source materials

and colleagues who share one's own interests. A major objective in Russian and Soviet studies should be 1) to identify such centers of research, 2) to secure their continued support, and 3) to open them to as many qualified personnel from the field as possible.

Various measures could be employed to identify centers of Russian and Soviet studies. A common tendency has been simply to take the list of twenty NDEA Title VI centers. However, these institutions were initially defined as "centers" not because of any research which they were fostering but because they each possessed, or showed the potential for creating, the resources necessary to train specialists in the field. The proliferation of degree-granting schools and the diffusion of degree recipients among numerous institutions, many having only the most rudimentary support facilities, further shows that a criterion based on training alone is inadequate for identifying research centers (Appendix II). Such a criterion would necessarily exclude all research centers that were not simultaneously graduate schools.

A more suitable measure of a research center would be the size of its library holdings. Besides constituting the single most critical resource for expanding knowledge, libraries are the most difficult component of a center to build up ex nihilo. With limited resources, it is best

first to identify the few largest library centers, and to begin the discussion of research centers from there.

We have been unable to determine precisely the relative size of Soviet area library collections in the United States. Suffice it to say that in 1972 the Library of Congress is clearly the largest, with about twice as many titles as Widener Library at Harvard and the New York Public Library, which in turn have approximately one third more titles than libraries in the next group.[11] The most comprehensive non-university collections are those at the New York Public Library, the Hoover Institution, and, of course, the Library of Congress.

Columbia and Harvard each have some six to eight one year senior research fellowships for which anyone can apply. The Hoover Institute also has recently inaugurated a fellowship program of similar scale. In addition to these stipend-bearing positions, several centers make their facilities available to "associates"; Harvard's program of forty regular associates from the surrounding region is far the most developed of these, but such arrangements exist at Michigan, Washington, etc., as well. These arrangements , one hopes, will be expanded in the future, but they today provide a national resource for researchers from all academic and non-academic institutions.

1) MAJOR LIBRARY FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS FOR THEIR

UTILIZATION SHOULD BE IDENTIFIED AND THEIR SUPPORT PLACED ON AS STABLE A FOOTING AS POSSIBLE.

2) THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS IS THE ONLY MAJOR COLLECTION OF RUSSIAN AND SOVIET MATERIALS WHICH HAS NO RESEARCH INSTITUTION FOR RUSSIAN AND SOVIET SPECIALISTS CONNECTED WITH IT OR NEARBY. AT A TIME WHEN NDEA SUPPORT IS BEING REDUCED, IT IS ALL THE MORE IMPORTANT TO TAKE MEASURES TO INSURE THAT SPECIALISTS ALREADY TRAINED IN THE FIELD HAVE THE FULLEST OPPORTUNITY TO APPLY THEIR SKILLS. WE THEREFORE SUGGEST THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO THE POSSIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A RESEARCH CENTER IN WASHINGTON, D. C. AT A MINIMUM, SUCH A CENTER WOULD BE DEFINED IN TERMS OF A LIMITED NUMBER OF DESKS AT OR NEAR THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS AND CARRYING STIPENDS FOR A SUMMER, SEMESTER, OR YEAR. AT MORE ELABORATE LEVELS IT COULD INCLUDE SEMINARS, JOINT PROJECTS, ETC.

OBVIOUSLY, NO SUCH PROJECT SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN IF IT WERE IN ANY WAY TO JEOPARDIZE THE CONTINUED DEVELOPMENT OF EXISTING LIBRARY-RELATED CENTERS.

B. RESEARCH PROJECTS

The record of grants for advanced Russian and Soviet studies provides a convenient index to major projects. Reviewing the chief funding agencies, we find surprisingly few major grants made to the field. Thus, the National Science Foundation (NSF) for Fiscal Year 1971 authorized one grant in economics ($42,000), two in geography (ca. $40,000), and none in anthropology, social psychology, psychology, political science or the history of science.[12] The National Endowment for the Humanities compiled a similar record in 1971, making only 2 of 126 research grants, and 6 of 319 fellowship grants, to the Russian-Soviet field.[13] Indeed, that body has recently subsidized studies on eighteenth century France as heavily as all research pertaining to Russia and the U.S.S.R. Both the National Institute of Health (NIH) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) are contributors to Soviet studies, though neither institution has yet supported more than two projects per annum.[14] ACLS is only supporting about one project per year, through its general programs, though, of course, that body also maintains an exchange with the U.S.S.R. through IREX. The Guggenheim Foundation has been reasonably active in the field, but its work is more than offset by the demise of the Fulbright-Hays program for

senior scholars in the Soviet area due to currency problems.[15]

It would be erroneous to conclude from these data that the problem consists in the unwillingness of funding agencies to support Russian and Soviet projects. During fiscal year 1971, for example, the ratio of Russian area approvals to applications at NSF was on the whole comparable to that for all fields together, and in geography as high as 2:2. For IREX's Exchange of Senior Scholars (including ACLS- Academy of Sciences) and also its Graduate-Student/Young Faculty Exchange the ratio has climbed steadily since the late 1960s.

The fact that the numbers of applicants to the IREX exchange of senior scholars has declined in three years from 69 to 44 and then to 37 shows that the major change recently has been on the side of demand, rather than supply.[16] During the same years the number of Guggenheim grants to the Russian-Soviet area has fallen from eight to four and then to two in 1972, reflecting a decline both in the quantity and competitive strength of applications.[17]

In short, there exists no overwhelming evidence that funding resources for research are inadequate, but considerable evidence that existing sources are underused by the field.

There would be little cause for concern over the level of use of existing support funds if present research

were uniformly high in quality and diverse in character. But as Herbert Ellison noted in his address to the special meeting called by the AAASS in Columbus on October 29, 1971,[18] Soviet studies research has yet to reach beyond the boundaries of separate disciplines and, we would add, beyond a limited range of formats. Several specialists have remarked to us on a certain monochromatic aspect to much advanced research in the field. If this is actually the case, measures should be taken to introduce a higher degree of diversity. Indeed, it is quite likely that the best means of stimulating the field as a whole is deliberately to foster diversity in the type and format of research. This might be achieved in four areas.

1. range of disciplines. The narrow range of disciplines in which advanced research is being conducted reflects the composition of the field as a whole, and will change only when that composition changes. The NIH, NIMH, NEH, NSF, ACLS-SSRC, Guggenheim and IREX all consider their charge at the level of advanced research to be the support of the most promising applications, without regard to developmental interests of the fields. Without changing this,

> IT WOULD BE WELL FOR AN APPROPRIATE BODY, SUCH AS THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE OF THE AAASS, TO MAKE KNOWN TO THESE AND OTHER FUNDING BODIES THE PRESENT STATE OF RESEARCH IN THE FIELDS, SO THAT

PROPOSALS IN UNDERDEVELOPED DISCIPLINES MIGHT BE READ WITH SPECIAL CARE.

2. short and long gauged projects. Russian and Soviet studies in all fields suffer from a "78 RPM syndrome", with the overwhelming majority of published research fitting neatly into the format of journal articles or PhD length monographs, regardless of the character of the project. Two means of encouraging longer and shorter gauged projects would be

a. TO INCREASE FACILITIES FOR PUBLISHING 40 TO 200 PAGE MONOGRAPHS. (See "Publications")
b. TO PROVIDE SCHOLARS IN THE FIELD WITH THE FULLEST INFORMATION AS TO 1) SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR LONG-TERM PROJECTS,AND 2) FELLOWSHIP POSITIONS AT MAJOR RESEARCH CENTERS.

3. joint research. The recent Deutsch-Platt-Senghaas study concluded that the most significant achievements in the social sciences over nearly half a century have tended to emerge "from large teams of scholars working in major intellectual centers."[19] While recognizing that such joint research is quite undesirable in certain important areas, and that most scholars and centers will probably continue to prefer individual research, the opportunity for joint projects in the Russian and Soviet field should be made as

great as possible. Already the project on "Comparative Communist Studies" has brought together several teams of researchers working simultaneously;[20] the East European Project at the International Development Research Center in Bloomington is doing the same in the field of economics, and several efforts of similar scope are underway at Michigan, Berkeley and elsewhere. By and large, however, such endeavors have been confined to the fields of political science, economics and demography. A new program of the Ford Foundation will make available funds for joint research in all fields to study advanced industrial nations, and Soviet scholars would do well to take advantage of this opportunity.[21] Collaborative research can scarcely be organized "from above", but every effort should be made to make known existing opportunities for joint and interdisciplinary work involving the fields of history, anthropology, sociology, and literature. A major focus of a new center in Washington might well be to encourage such projects.

4. collaborative projects with Soviet scholars. In 1968 the Committee on the Future reported to the IUCTG on the desirability of collaborative projects involving American and Soviet researchers.[22] In January, 1971, representatives of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration opened discussions with the Soviet Academy

of Sciences on cooperation in space research, and in May of that year the Surgeon General of the United States met with his Soviet counterpart to consider joint research on cancer and heart disease. Clearly, the time has arrived at which collaborative research in other areas is a real possibility. It is to be hoped that the major research centers, the AAASS, and other scholarly associations will actively promote such research in the social sciences, history and literature, devoting particular attention to comparative studies involving the U.S.S.R. A first modest step would be the publication of papers and discussion at the first Soviet-American meeting of historians in the autumn of 1972.

C. RESEARCH.PRIORITIES.

In order to insure a more balanced development of research activity in the future it will be necessary to identify neglected areas and to state priorities. It is quite impossible to leave this simply to the informal exchange of information and ideas among scholars, for, as the economist Fritz Machlup observed, "The field of knowledge production is, for the greater part, not guided by the market mechanism."[23] This is not to imply that such priorities should be imposed upon the field in any coercive manner, or in any way which would deny to individual researchers

their full freedom of choice. But to the extent that priority-setting powers already exist in the area of Soviet and Russian studies, they should be exercised deliberately and fully.

The principal priority setting bodies at present are IREX (through its Domestic Fellowship Program), the major research centers, the Research and Development Committee of the AAASS, and those foundations like Ford which seek to stimulate the field through selective grants. Formerly the ACLS-SSRC Joint Committee fulfilled this function[24] but that group is now defunct and the ACLS grants which remain are made without regard to the developmental needs of the field. The Office of Education can not properly be included among priority setting bodies in research as its activities pertain only to training.[25]

The above agencies have contributed immeasurably to the promotion of research in the Russian and Soviet areas. Yet there are good grounds for believing that the function of determining priorities is still inadequately performed. The resort to ad hoc commissions and impromptu meetings to deal with such issues is evidence of this shortcoming, as is the fact that significant decisions have been taken by funding bodies (including O.E.) with little direct input from specialists, centers, and professional groups. This situation should be corrected.

One agency for accomplishing this is the Research and Development Committee of the AAASS. This body has recently received a three year grant to enable it to expand its activities to include the supporting of symposia and conferences in neglected areas.[26] However, such efforts alone will not suffice. The following programs might be undertaken as well:

1. EACH YEAR THE SLAVIC REVIEW MIGHT COMMISSION A REVIEW ARTICLE ON ALL NORTH AMERICAN AND WEST EUROPEAN WRITINGS (MONOGRAPHS, ARTICLES, PhD DISSERTATIONS) FROM THE PREVIOUS YEAR IN EACH OF THE MAJOR AREAS OF RUSSIAN AND SOVIET STUDIES. SUCH ARTICLES NEED NOT BE LONG, BUT SHOULD SEEK TO CHARACTERIZE GENERAL RESEARCH TRENDS AND NEEDS.
2. EACH YEAR AT THE CONVENTION OF THE AAASS THE R & D COMMITTEE MIGHT HOLD AN OPEN FORUM AT WHICH ANYONE COULD PRESENT HIS VIEWS ON RESEARCH NEEDS. SUCH SESSIONS MIGHT BE BROKEN DOWN INTO SUB-SESSIONS ON LITERATURE, SOCIAL SCIENCES, HISTORY, ETC.
3. EVERY THREE TO FIVE YEARS THE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE COULD APPOINT SEVERAL SCHOLARS FROM OUTSIDE THAT BODY TO WRITE A GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE FIELD, INCLUDING PRIORITY SUGGES-

TIONS. THESE ESSAYS COULD BE USED BY THE R & D COMMITTEE IN ITS WORK AND FOR ANY OTHER PRESENTATIONS BEFORE FUNDING BODIES. ALTERNATIVELY, SUCH STUDIES MIGHT BE INITIATED BY LEADING RESEARCH CENTERS.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

Section II of this report indicates that the "Sputnik boom" in Russian and Soviet studies has definitely ended. Sharp declines in both language and area training have been registered during the past four years, and these declines exceed in magnitude any general roll-back of student interest which may affect foreign studies as a whole.

Section III points out the many areas in which fundamental research and the support facilities which make research possible have developed during the past decade, but at the same time emphasizes the need for major efforts in both areas.

Since the major proposals to emerge from this study are indicated clearly throughout the text, it is not necessary to review them here. Far more important than the specific suggestions included after each division of this report is the general conclusion towards which the entire study points, namely, the need for a greater degree of coordination at the national level of all aspects of the field of Russian and Soviet studies. Whether in the form of national manpower estimates and projections, the identification of research needs or the development and utilization of research facilities, a perspective that embraces the entire nation should take precedence over any which

relates only to local interests. The limited resources available to the field necessitates this, as does the reduction of NDEA involvement. No less is such a perspective called for by the sheer size and complexity of Russian-Soviet studies today. It is to be hoped that such an outlook will inform all forthcoming discussions and planning decisions.

FOOTNOTES III. RESEARCH

1. This approximation is based on 1) a review of articles published and books reviewed in the years 1967-1969 in the following journals:

Slavic Review. v. 26-28.
American Political Science Review. v. 61-63.
American Economic Review. v. 57-59.

2) a review of articles by Americans published in the years 1967-1969 (except as noted) in the following journals:

Candian Slavic Studies. v. 2-3 (1968-69).
Russian Review. v. 26-28.
Slavonic and East European Review. v. 45-47.
Survey. no. 62-72.
Jahrbücher für Geschichte Osteuropas. v. 15-17.
Harvard Slavic Studies. v. 5. (1970).
Indiana Slavic Studies. v. 5. (1970).

Two other statistics give some idea of the potential pool of research scholars from which these four hundred are drawn. The approximate number of PhDs in Russian and Soviet topics from 1930 through 1969, as estimated from Jess Dossick's listing of doctoral dissertations, was two thousand. (Dossick, Doctoral Research on Russia and the Soviet Union. New York, 1960. Also annual listing in the Slavic Review beginning with v. 23 (1964).) And our estimate of the size of the academic portion of the AAASS working in the Russian-Soviet field is 1600, based on membership information provided by George Demko, former Executive Secretary of the AAASS.

2. A sample of AAASS membership shows that approximately 25% of AAASS members employed by academic institutions are concentrated at NDEA Title VI centers. We have assumed that the percentage of research scholars attached to NDEA centers is not less than the proportion of all area specialists; it is probably somewhat higher.

3. We are indebted to Roger E. Kanet, Chairman, AAASS Committee on Bibliography and Documentation, for copies of the recent reports of his committee and of his essay "Some Problems with Current Methods of Bibliography Management in Slavic and East European Studies" from which we have drawn both information and advice on this subject.

4. For a thorough assessment of other bibliographic materials produced by the Office of External Research see Cyril Black, "Government Sponsored Research in International Studies." World Politics, v. 22:4 (July 1970), pp. 582-596.

5. James N. Rosenau. International Studies and the Social Sciences. U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Institute of International Studies. June 1971. p. 34.

6. Princeton University Press, 1972.

7. Statistics on Fulbright-Hays Program supplied by John Paul, Institute of International Studies.

8. Legislative authority for this program is contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-329), Title II C, Section 231.

9. The authors wish to thank Joseph A. Placek, Head, Slavic Division, University Library, University of Michigan, for his help in detailing the future needs of libraries and librarians in this field.

10. P. A. Chuvikov. Pechat SSSR za 50 let, Moscow, 1967, Table 3, p. 171; also Ezhegodnik Knigi SSSR, 1967, compiled by Zdenek David, Firestone Library, Princeton.

11. Complete data on library holdings to 1957 are to be found in Melville J. Ruggles, Vaclav Mostecky, Russian and East European Publications in U.S. Libraries, New York, 1960. The response to a survey by the authors was insufficient to revise these figures except for the largest collections.

12. We wish to thank Dr. Howard Hines and Dr. James Blackman of the National Science Foundation for providing these approximations of their grants in this field.

13. We wish to thank Dr. William Emerson, NEH, for the data cited here.

Of the 319 fellowships given in 1971, 28 were for study in foreign areas; the distribution was:

Southeast Asia	15
17th-18th century France	6
U.S.S.R.	6
Wales	1

The topics of the six Soviet fellowships are also instructive; three were in literature, one in theatre, and two in Russian history.

14. Information on grants from these institutions is contained in their respective annual grant lists.

National Institute of Mental Health. Mental Health Research Grant Awards.

Public Health Service. Grants and Awards: National Institutes of Health.

15. The Fulbright-Hays Fellowship Program for graduate students and young faculty of course continues, but the senior program, operating only on PL-480 excess currency funds, cannot offer support in the Soviet Union.

16. IREX, "Exchange Programs with the Soviet Union 1958/59 -- 1972/73. American Applicants, Nominees, and Participants," p. 1.

17. Information on grant recipients is contained in the Reports of the President and Treasurer, 1969 and 1970: John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation; and the pamphlet Fellowships: 1972, also from the Guggenheim Foundation. In 1969 the grants to the Russian-Soviet field represented eleven percent of the total grants to foreign areas; in 1970 six percent; and in 1972 only three percent. Of the fourteen fellowships, six were for literature studies and six for history.

18. A summary of Ellison's address is contained in the AAASS Newsletter, v. XI, n. 4 (Winter, 1971), at p.2.

19. A summary of the Deutsch-Platt-Senghaas study may be found in "Social Science Gains Tied to Big Teams of Scholars." New York Times, March 16, 1971, p. 26.

20. The Carnegie Corporation grant to this project supports four sub-groups on the following topics: "The Political Culture of Communism"; "Ecological Aspects of Communistic Revolutions"; "The Italian Communist Party"; and "Soviet Society". See the project's periodica Newsletter on Comparative Communist Studies (Buffalo, N.Y.)

21. Ford Foundation, "Common Problems Research Competition."

22. On Scholarly Exchanges and Relations with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. 1968, p. 17.

23. Fritz Machlup. The Production and Distribution of Knowledge in the United States. Princeton, 1962, p. 28.

24. In addition to the use of development funds, the Joint Committee in 1957-8 undertook a study of future tasks. See Subcommittee on Review, "Graduate Training in Russian Studies," March 10, 1958.

25. The Language and Area Research Section of the Division of Foreign Studies, Institute of International Education,(Office of Education) gives attention solely to research to develop language and area studies texts and materials on world areas for which such material is not available.

26. Information on the anticipated areas of activity of this committee is contained in "A Proposal to the Ford Foundation for a Three-Year Grant for Support of the Development Activities of the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies." (Ms.) December, 1971.

APPENDIX I.

APPROXIMATE ANNUAL EXPENDITURE: RESEARCH AND TRAINING ON RUSSIA AND THE SOVIET UNION[1]

Note: These computations are an exercise in viewing the Russian-Soviet field as a single national whole, rather than an effort to develop absolutely precise cost figures.

1.	Salaries[2]		
	Higher education	43 291 000.	
	Non-academic	4 072 000.	
			47 363 000.
2.	NDEA Centers (less teaching, NDFL, and libraries)[3]		5 159 000.
3.	NDFL Fellowships		1 125 000.
4.	Summer Language Programs[4] (Fed'l contribution)		530 000.
5.	High School Language Training[5]		2 410 000.
6.	Defense Language Institute[6]		692 000.
7.	IREX Domestic Fellowship		
	Program-Study	105 000.	
	Doctoral Dissertation	50 000.	
			155 000.
8.	Fulbright-Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research		145 000.
9.	IREX Soviet Exchanges (American side only)[7]		256 150.
10.	National Institute of Mental Health		12 000.
11.	National Endowment for the Humanities		50 000.
12.	National Science Foundation		14 000.
13.	American Council of Learned Societies		45 000.
14.	Guggenheim Foundation		20 000.

15.	Ford Foundation[8] (Slavic Biblio. & Documentation Center)	80 000.
16.	Carnegie Foundation (Comparative Communism Project)	80 000.
17.	Danforth Foundation	35 000.
18.	Library of Congress[9]	70 000.
19.	New York Public Library	50 000.
20.	NDEA Center Libraries	1 588 000.
		$59 879 150.

1. Due to the incompleteness of available data, it was impossible to use the accounts only of a single year. Therefore each item was estimated for either fiscal year 1969 or fiscal year 1970.

2. The estimate of the total salary bill of area specialists was produced in the following way.

A. Area specialists.

AAASS membership in the Russian-Soviet field (approx.[a])	2100
AATSEEL " " " " "	" 1800
- overlap of membership with AAASS	- 300
- high school teachers, AATSEEL	- 350
	1150
	3250

[a]Approximations throughout based on information provided by AAASS and AATSEEL.

B. An approximate percentage of AAASS members not affiliated with academic institutions of 15% was derived by balancing Lambert's figure on non-academic specialists[b] and our own estimate from a sample of AAASS membership. Applying this proportion to AAASS membership, we approximated the academic and non-academic portions of the specialists.

315 non-academic	1785 academic (AAASS)
	1150 AATSEEL
	2935 academic

[b]Richard D. Lambert, Report on Language and Area Study Programs. p. III-1.

C. Average salary and benefit figures for each group were used to approximate total cost of salaries for all Russian-Soviet area specialists.

3. NDEA and NDFL information is taken from budget information for fiscal 1970 supplied by the Institute of International Education, Office of Education.

4. The federal contribution is the only portion of this expenditure which can be measured adequately from existing data.

5. Estimate of high school teaching cost is based on preliminary results of the MLA census of high school Russian enrollments, 1970-71, and the following cost formula:

number of students/100 = number of teachers
Total cost = number of teachers x $10,500 + number of students x $5.

6. This is a very rough estimate based on per capita training cost for all languages combined and number of students in Russian, for fiscal 1971.

7. Contributions of various foundations and government institutions and agencies have been estimated using direct reports to the authors, published lists of grants, and annual reports. Error is almost certainly on the side of underestimation in all cases.

8. Most of the Ford Foundation grants to the field of Russian and Soviet studies are accounted for in the budgets of the recipients, and enter our estimate under those entries.

9. For both the Library of Congress and the New York Public Library, the expenditures given here are for acquisitions only, and are only estimates. In the case of the Library of Congress, only direct acquisitions are included, and not the cost of the exchange program with the Lenin State Library.

RUSSIAN AND SOVIET STUDIES
IN THE UNITED STATES

Typographical Errors To Be Noted

1. Title page: correctly, The Institute for Advanced Study.

2. Table of Contents: III.C.: Priorities

3. Page 2: "straitened circumstances." (1st paragraph).

4. Page 57: "the identification of research needs,..." (3rd paragraph)

5. Page 58: "The limited resources available to the field necessitate this, ..."

6. Page 59: 1. 2) Canadian Slavic Studies

George Demko, former Executive Secretary of the AAASS.